

### REMARKS

A final office action, which was mailed October 17, 2006, rejected all pending claims 1-15 on obviousness grounds. An Interview with Examiner Rivas was held on December 27, 2006. In this Amendment in Reply, Applicants amend claims 1 and 15. As such, claims 1-15 remain pending. In light of the understandings reached during the interview summarized below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration in view of the amendments and arguments set forth in this response.

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned thanks Examiner Rivas for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on December 27, 2006. During the Interview, differences between (i) APIs (application programming interfaces) as described by Applicants' specification and (ii) a policy for extending tablespace as described by U.S. Publ. Pat. Appl. 2004/0122799) to Goyal et al. ("the Goyal reference") were discussed.

Agreement was reached regarding language to overcome the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In particular, agreement was reached that, in the context of Applicants' claims, the Goyal reference does not disclose generating an API based upon scores for combinations of candidate tables and candidate APIs. In this Amendment in Reply, Applicants amend independent claims 1 and 15 in a way believed to be in accordance with what the Examiner indicated would overcome the rejections.

Applicants again thank the Examiner for taking the time to interview this case.

### CLAIM AMENDMENTS: CLAIMS 1 AND 15

In accordance with the agreement that was reached with the Examiner during the interview, Applicants amend claims 1 and 15. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in FIGS. 7-8 and in the specification at paragraphs [0042, 0045-0047]. As such, these amendments introduce no new matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103: CLAIMS 1-15

The office action rejected claims 1-15 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. 5,386,498 to Kakefuda ("the Kakefuda reference") in view of U.S. Publ. Pat. Appl. 2004/0122799 to Goyal et al. ("the Goyal reference"). Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Applicants' amended claims are patentable over the cited reference because the references, either or alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all elements of Applicants' claims. For example, as discussed during the Interview, the Goyal reference does not teach or suggest generating a master API, as recited in Applicants' amended claims. Furthermore, the office action concedes the limitations of the Kakefuda reference. (See Office Action at page 3, lines 10-15.) For at least these reasons, the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious Applicants' independent claims 1 or 15. As such, amended claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the cited references, as are claims 2-14, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 1-15 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSIONS

Accordingly, each of the pending claims 1-15 (as amended) defines patentable subject matter over the cited prior art. Furthermore, each of the pending claims is believed to be in form for allowance. As such, Applicants request that the Examiner allow all pending claims 1-15.

Although Applicants have amended certain claims to advance prosecution, Applicants believe that, before amendment, the claims contained patentable subject matter. As such, Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of the same or similar scope in the future.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant : Yuh-Cherng Wu, Ph.D., et al.  
Serial No. : 10/782,576  
Filed : February 19, 2004  
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-090001 / 2003P00410US

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Although no fees are believed to be owed, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan. 10, 2007

Craig O. Thompson  
Craig O. Thompson  
Reg. No. 47,990

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696